## REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated December 7, 2004. Claims 1 to 4 remain in the application, of which Claims 1 and 3 are independent. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claims 2 and 4 were objected to as allegedly being inconsistent with their base claim. Claims 2 and 4 have been amended to adopt the Examiner's suggested language regarding "if the second [first] mode is selected." Thus, withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 and 3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,926,175 (Sturgeon), and Claims 1 to 4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,084,638 (Hare) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,373,503 (Perkes). Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

The present invention concerns controlling a display apparatus, such as a TV monitor. According to the invention, a connecting unit is controlled to detect a display unit as a monitor of an external apparatus if a first operating mode is selected by a remote controller, and the connecting unit is controlled to detect the display unit as a monitor of a display apparatus if a second operating mode is selected by the remote controller. As a result, a TV can be operated to display a TV signal in one mode, and can be operated as a monitor of a computer in another mode, where a user can operate input/output devices connected to the TV.

Referring specifically to the claims, amended independent Claim 1 is a display apparatus, comprising a remote controller, a display unit, a connecting unit which forms a connection between the display apparatus and an external apparatus, and a control

unit which controls the connecting unit to detect the display unit as a monitor of the external apparatus if a first operating mode is selected by the remote controller, and controls the connecting unit to detect the display unit as a monitor of the display apparatus if a second operating mode is selected by the remote controller.

Amended independent Claim 3 is a method claim that substantially corresponds to Claim 1.

The applied art is not seen to disclose or to suggest the features of Claims 1 and 3, and in particular is not seen to disclose or to suggest at least the feature of controlling a connecting unit of a display apparatus to detect the display apparatus as a monitor of an external apparatus if a first operating mode is selected by a remote controller of the display apparatus, and controlling the connecting unit to detect the display apparatus as a monitor of the display apparatus if a second operating mode is selected by the remote controller.

Sturgeon is merely seen to disclose that an apparatus 100 that has a computer mode and a TV mode. The apparatus 100 includes a display unit 110 and a computer system 115 which is controllable by a remote controller 125. (see column 3, lines 50 to 55 and column 5, lines 59 to 63). The remote controller can be used to switch modes from the computer (PC) mode to the TV mode by operating a button on the remote controller or by selecting a TV source item on a MENU bar. Thus, while Sturgeon may provide the ability for a TV to display both TV and computer signals on the same screen, Sturgeon is not seen to include controlling a connecting unit of a display apparatus to detect the display apparatus as a monitor of an external apparatus if a first operating mode is selected by a remote controller of the display apparatus, and controlling the connecting unit to detect the display apparatus as a monitor of the display apparatus if a second

operating mode is selected by the remote controller. Accordingly, Claims 1 and 3 are not believed to be anticipated by Sturgeon.

Hare is merely seen to disclose an interface extension system in which the display of a PC can be displayed on a television, thereby permitting users to operate interactive PC games on the screen of a television. However, as admitted in the Office Action, Hare does not disclose a remote controller and therefore, cannot disclose or suggest at least the feature of controlling a connecting unit of a display apparatus to detect the display apparatus as a monitor of an external apparatus if a first operating mode is selected by a remote controller of the display apparatus, and controlling the connecting unit to detect the display apparatus as a monitor of the display apparatus if a second operating mode is selected by the remote controller. Nonetheless, the Office Action cites Perkes as allegedly making up for Hare's deficiencies.

Perkes is merely seen to disclose a multimedia computer and television apparatus in which a dual mode monitor can display both a TV signal and a computer signal. Perkes further discloses a remote control input device 40 that can be used to operate the computer. However, Perkes discloses nothing of any detail about the remote control input device 40, and in particular, discloses nothing about controlling a connecting unit of a display apparatus to detect the display apparatus as a monitor of an external apparatus if a first operating mode is selected by a remote controller of the display apparatus as a monitor of the display apparatus as a monitor of the display apparatus if a second operating mode is selected by the remote controller. Accordingly, Claims 1 to 4 are not believed to be have been obvious over Hare and Perkes.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the entire application is

believed to be in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

Attorney for Applicants

Edward A. Kmett

Registration No.: 42,746

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO 30 Rockefeller Plaza New York, New York 10112-2200 Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA\_MAIN 92969v1